

is shaped like a horse-shoe; that the hills curve round; that the greater part of the modern town is built between their base and the harbour; that the fortress from which the marbles were taken stands on a rock projecting into the sea, and forming one side of the mouth of the harbour.

Of the ancient city, Vitruvius has left us a very minute description. His words are as follows:—"Mausolus, perceiving that Halicarnassus was a place naturally fortified, a good depot, and convenient harbour, made it his royal residence. As the form of the site was curved like a theatre; on the lowest ground, near the port, was placed the forum. Along the curve, about halfway up its height, was made a broad street; as it were, a *præcinctio*. In the centre of this street stood the Mausoleum, constructed with such marvellous works, that it is considered one of the seven wonders of the world. In the centre of the citadel above was the Temple of Mars, containing a colossal statue, such as are termed *deipoloi*, made by the illustrious hand of Telochares; or, according to others, of Timotheus. On the summit of the right hand extremity of the curve, the Temple of Venus and Mercury, close to the fountain Salmacis. Now, in like manner as, on the right hand, was this Temple of Venus and Mercury, and the above-named fountain; so, on the left horn, or extremity of the curve, stood the royal palace, which king Mausolus placed so as to suit his own designs; for from it can be seen on the right hand the forum, the harbour, and the whole circuit of the walls; on the left a secret port so concealed under the mountains, that no one could spy or ascertain what was going on there; that the king from his own palace might, without the knowledge of any one, see to all that was necessary to his fleet and army."

Few cities of antiquity have been described as distinctly as Halicarnassus in this passage; and though some of the expressions of Vitruvius are of doubtful interpretation, the greater part of his topography may be recognized in the Admiralty plan before us. We may in the first place assume, that the theatre-like curve on which the city was built was wholly contained within the circuit of the ancient walls, as traced out in this map. We find this curve at once in the outline of the harbour. Taking the three central points first—the forum will be the lowest of the three, *in imo secundum portum*; half way up the height, *per medium altitudinis curvaturam præcinctio*; a broad street, in the centre of which was the Mausoleum; in the centre of the citadel above, *in summa arce mediâ*, the Temple of Mars; on the highest part of the right hand extremity of the curve, *in summo cornu dextra*, the Temple of Venus and Mercury, close to the fountain of Salmacis; and on the opposite height, at the extremity of the curve, the royal palace of Mausolus.

The phrase, *in summa arce mediâ*, which I have translated, "in the centre of the citadel above," is of doubtful interpretation, and does not fix with accuracy the position of the Temple of Mars. From the whole context, however, we may infer that it stood on the high ground north of the Mausoleum. It may be objected that we have no mention in any other author of a citadel in this place; and that we may rather suppose, from the statement of Strabo and Arrian, that there were only two citadels; one in the harbour, the other, as its name, Salmacis, would imply, near the fountain, on the left, which I have just mentioned. But it by no means follows that there was not a third citadel immediately under the north wall, corresponding, perhaps, to that which Arrian describes as being the nearest to the side of the inland town, Mylasa. Or again, it is possible, that the word *arx* is used by Vitruvius, in this passage, to express the fortified heights rather than an acropolis. I now come to the expressions *in summo dextro et in summo laevo cornu*. Now, on turning to the Admiralty map, it seems evident that the two points, the rock on which the Turkish fortress stands and the opposite projection, must be, the first, the site of the palace of Mausolus, the second, that of the Temple of Venus and Mercury, close to the fountain Salmacis.

While adopting this arrangement, as the most probable that I can suggest, I must add, that it must be regarded as only a partial adjustment of the plan of Vitruvius. The palace of Vitruvius, placed on this rock, might,

it is true, command a very extensive view of the town to the right; but where is his little secret port to the left, mentioned also by Scylax of Caryanda as the closed port, and corresponding apparently to the smaller closed port at Rhodes; from the plan of which city that of Halicarnassus was perhaps borrowed? Was it a mere dock, roofed over like a modern dock-yard, to conceal it from observation, and since filled up by the sea? Where, again, is the island Zephyria, which the sea, according to Pliny, joined to the main land of Halicarnassus? Where is Arrian's citadel in the island, which Captain Beaufort and other excellent authorities place in Aiconnesos, an island at some distance; though the words of Arrian would imply its immediate proximity to the town. Where, lastly, in Arrian's citadel of Salmacis? None of these questions have as yet been satisfactorily solved. I will only on this occasion allude to them, as difficulties which are a fit subject for researches on the spot. The point which is more immediately interesting to us at this moment is, does the plan before you answer to the description in Vitruvius to the extent that I have proposed; that is, in its main features? If so, the Turkish fortress is built on the site of the palace of Mausolus. The site of the Mausoleum must be sought for where I have placed it. This part of the town is, as you see, occupied by the modern street. No foundations of any ancient public edifice have, I believe, been found here, except the remains of a Doric temple; and a little higher, under the wall, the remains of a building, the walls of which Mr. Hamilton states to be of Hellenic masonry. Neither of these buildings appear to have any well-grounded claim to be considered the Mausoleum; nor, as far as I am aware, has such claim ever been very strongly maintained. The Doric temple, in the judgment of Choiseul Gouffier, appeared of a time certainly later than the Mausoleum; and his opinion seems borne out by the views and sections given in his work, and by the late character of the Greek inscriptions, with which the columns are inscribed; though these might, certainly, have been added at a subsequent period.

The other building Mr. Hamilton conjectured to be the Mausoleum, because the measurement of one of its sides, about 100 feet, seemed to correspond with the dimensions of the sides of the Mausoleum, as given by Pliny; but this is an argument to which, as I shall subsequently show, no great weight can be attached.

If, as I have shown, the Turkish fortress does not occupy the situation of the Mausoleum, but more probably of the palace of Mausolus; we must suppose that the sculptured slabs in its walls were either part of the materials of that palace lying *in situ*; or that, if originally part of the Mausoleum, they were brought down from the higher ground. History has not left us very much information as to the building of this fortress. We find in the Byzantine historian, Ducas, xxi. p. 64, that the grand master of the Knights of St. John, taking out with him squared stones, bitumen, timber, and other building materials, from Rhodes, built the fort of Petronium (whence the modern name of Bodrum is said to be derived) in Caria. Busio, in his history of the knights, records the same building of the fortress in the grand mastership of Philibert de Naillac, A.D. 1399, a date rather earlier than that given by Ducas; and adds that it was built on the site of the ancient Halicarnassus. Fontanus, the historian of the siege of Rhodes, of which he was a contemporary, states that a German knight called Henry Schegelhold used in this building the materials of the Mausoleum. His words are, *ex ruinis Halicarnassi, pyramidibusque Mausoli sepulchri*. There is no difficulty in supposing that the slabs from the Mausoleum may have been transported such a short distance as from the middle of the town to the fort. We have indeed some reason for believing that some of these slabs were carried across to the neighbouring island of Cos, and there used in the construction of another fortress which has been recently visited by Sir Charles Fellowes, and in the exterior walls of which he observed three bas-reliefs, very similar in style to those of Bodrum.

I will now proceed to examine whether the character of the art, the nature of the subject represented, or the measurements of these slabs, as compared with the structure and di-

mensions of the Mausoleum, enable us in any degree to connect them with that building. First, as to the character of the art. Is the style of the Bodrum marbles that of the period of the Mausoleum, A.C. 353? Are they worthy of the great reputation of the artists by whom the sculptures of the Mausoleum were executed, and of the praise bestowed by Pliny and Vitruvius on those works? The first of these questions it is not very easy to answer.

Of the remains of ancient art, that have being preserved to us, there are few which we can assign with certainty to the century immediately preceding Alexander the Great. The works which have been conjecturally assigned to the hand of Scopas and Praxiteles, such as the group of Niobides, present very little analogy with the Bodrum bas-reliefs; but these two kind of sculptures, even when executed at the same period, often present essential differences in design and treatment. There exists, however, a specimen of baso-relievo which we can assign to this period; the chariag monument of Lyciscrates, executed, as appears from the archon's name upon it, A.C. 334. On comparing this with the Bodrum marbles, we may perceive very considerable resemblance in style. In both bas-reliefs, the extreme elongation of the forms, and the opaqueness, if not meagreness, of the muscular development, at once strike the eye. Something of the same lengthiness of type may be traced in the design of some of the silver coins of Tarentum, which, we have reason to believe, are not much later than this period. These peculiarities of style in the Bodrum marbles may be fairly compared with Pliny's expression, in speaking of the changes of style introduced by Lysippus and Euphranor; of the former of whom he says, that he made the bodies of his statues "*graciliora sicciore rague*." These artists flourished at the period to which we would refer these marbles; and it is highly probable that the new style introduced by them would have its influence in the decoration of the Mausoleum.

The consideration of the probable date of the Bodrum marbles, so far as it can be inferred from the style of the sculpture, leads at once to the question as to their merit as works of art. The idea which they suggest is that of works executed rather in the decline of Greek sculpture, than in its finest period; made rather for the subordinate purpose of architectural decoration than as the *chef d'œuvre* of great artists.

The general composition is not deficient in that union of symmetrical balance with variety of grouping for which Greek art is so distinguished; but the action has something of a theatrical character; the attitudes of the figures are strained; the forms, as I have already noticed, meagre, and unnaturally slender. Admitting that their original beauty has been much impaired by time, weather, and mutilation; it is difficult for us to imagine that we contemplate in these marbles the production of such artists as Scopas and Praxiteles, and of those thought worthy to be their rivals, Bryaxis, Leochares, according to others, Timotheus, the sculptors of the Mausoleum. We learn from Vitruvius, that they severally decorated one side of the Mausoleum with sculpture, and that they vied with each other in this great work. With such zeal was this rivalry maintained, that in Pliny's time, a period of the most refined criticism, it could not be decided which artist had performed his task best. The occasion was worthy of their efforts. They were called upon to celebrate, by the highest effort of genius, the memory of a great prince, at whose funeral obsequies the chief poets and rhetoricians of Greece contended for the prize. Whether the Bodrum marbles are worthy of the greatness of the occasion, and of the fame of the artists, is a question which I leave to more experienced judges to determine.

The story told in these bas-reliefs is a combat of Amazons and Greek warriors; and it is a very natural matter for speculation, how far the subject here represented may have reference to some portion of the mythical history of Caria, or of the house of Mausolus. The combat of Amazons was one of the most favourite themes of the Greek artist. The subject had a peculiar claim for the Greek mind, as a figurative or typical mode of expressing the deliverance of the Hellenic people from the Persian yoke. The Amazons, a